



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,525	09/19/2003	Julle M. Werbit	P26,038-A USA	5811
23307	7590	02/19/2010	EXAMINER	
FOX ROTHSCILD LLP			AN, IG TAI	
997 Lenox Drive, Bldg. #3			ART UNIT	
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648			PAPER NUMBER	
			3687	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			02/19/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,525

Applicant(s)

WERBITT, JULIE M.

Examiner

lg T. An

Art Unit

3687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2009.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,9-12,39-44,47-55,57-79,81-83,85-93,110,112-116,118,120,122-125,127,129-136,139-154 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-7,9-12,39-44,47-55,57-79,81-83,85-93,110,112-116,118,120,122-125,127,129-136 and 139-154.

DETAILED ACTION

The Amendment filed on 7 December 2009 has been acknowledged. Claims 150 – 154 are newly presented. Currently, Claims 1 - 7, 9 - 12, 39 - 44, 47 - 55, 57 - 79, 81 - 83, 85 - 93, 110, 112 - 116, 118, 120, 122 – 125, 127, 129 – 136 and 139 – 154 are pending and considered as set forth.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claims 1 - 7 and 9 – 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the status" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2 – 7 and 9 – 12 are dependent from claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2 – 7 and 9 – 12 carry same deficiencies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. **Claims 1 – 3, 6, 11 – 12, 39 – 42, 49 – 51, 54 – 55, 57 – 59, 61 – 64, 66 – 67, 69 – 70, 73, 75 – 77, 81, 85 – 87, 90 – 91, 93, 110, 114 – 115, 118, 120, 122 – 125, 127, 142 – 143, and 145 – 154 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasse (US 7257547) in view of Mayer et al. (Hereinafter Mayer) (US 20020026364) and in further view of Cogen (US 20020138350).**

As per Claims 1, 39, 50, 59, 69, 86, 110, 150 – 151 and 153, Terasse teaches providing patron units to patrons for use at a venue, wherein the patron units are devices having, wireless communication capability and interactive display screens

(Abstract teaches order terminal having wireless communication and touch sensitive screen);

enabling patrons to order items, request services, and/or browse information associated with the venue via the patron units wirelessly (Abstract teaches a user can view contents of service items and order desired item using the patron units which communicate with server wirelessly);

displaying locations of the patron units on the display screens of the portable staff units enabling staff members to locate patron units when delivering items and/or servicing requests (Column 13 lines 1 – 23 teaches staff unit displaying dishes and table number where the ordered dishes should be delivered to).

providing, to a plurality of patrons, a patron unit in communication with one more central computer systems (Abstract teaches order terminals having wireless communication and touch sensitive screen), each of said patron units providing the functions of:

providing an interactive display (Abstract teaches order terminal having wireless communication and touch sensitive screen);

allowing a patron to input a request (Abstract teaches a user can view contents of service items and order desired item using the patron units which communicate with server wirelessly);

displaying the status of open requests for said patron (Abstract, Column 12 line 41 – 63, Claim 19 and 20 language teaches the order status displayed to the order terminals);

sending a location or other identifier to said central computers (Column 10 line 57 – Column 11 line 30 teaches sending table location of the order terminal to the central control unit); and

receiving and displaying information from said central computers (Column 2 line 43 – 48 teaches control unit sending menu information and updates for the existing data in the terminals);

viewing outstanding requests and their status from one or more of said patron units (Abstract, Column 12 line 41 – 63, and Claim 19 and 20 language teaches the order status displayed to the order terminals);

allowing a staff member to update the status of an outstanding patron request (Column 8 line 40 - 64 and Column 12 line 41 – 63 teaches that kitchen terminal used by staff updates the status of the ordered food to all the terminal including order terminals of the patrons) and

providing one or more central computer systems (Abstract and Column 5 line 9 – 13 teaches control unit and central processor), said one or more central computer systems providing the functions of:

identifying a plurality of patron units by location or a specific identifier (Abstract, Column 5 line 9 – 13 and Column 6 line 55 - Column 7 line 35 teaches that the terminal receptacle read the identification code from the table top terminal, and table top terminal incorporate the table identification code when it sends its order. Therefore, the central system would recognize the location of the table top terminal using the identification code);

receiving and processing requests from a plurality of patrons via said plurality of patron units (Abstract and Column 4 line 22 – Column 5 line 13 teaches the central control units receives orders from the table top terminals then send it to worktable terminals or kitchen terminals);

interfacing with an external point of sale system (Abstract teaches control unit communicate with the accounting unit).

However, Terasa does not expressly disclose providing portable staff units to staff members of the venue, wherein the portable staff units are wireless devices having interactive display screens;

enabling staff members to view information about orders and/or requests made by the patrons via the portable staff units; and

displaying a map showing the location of one or more of units;

providing, to a plurality of staff, a portable staff unit in communication with said one or more central computer systems, each of said staff units providing the functions of:

providing an interactive display;

sending requests to said central computers for information regarding requests or patrons;

allowing a staff member to input requests for patrons; and

receiving and processing requests from a plurality of staff.

Mayer discloses electronic waiter system providing portable staff units to staff members of the venue, wherein the portable staff units are wireless devices having

interactive display screens (Figure 1, Paragraph 9, 20 – 23 teaches wait staffs having handheld portable devices with interactive screen and wireless communication function.;

enabling staff members to view information about orders and/or requests made by the patrons via the portable staff units (Paragraph 11 and 23 teaches waiter/waitress receiving orders from the patrons and order summaries or order confirmation is displayed on the screen of handheld device of the waiter/waitress); and

providing, to a plurality of staff, a portable staff unit in communication with said one or more central computer systems (Paragraph 19 – 23), each of said staff units providing the functions of:

providing an interactive display (Paragraph 19 – 22 teaches interactive touch screen display);

sending requests to said central computers for information regarding requests or patrons (Paragraph 19 – 23 teaches waiter or waitress to receive order from the patrons using the portable handheld device, and the order is sent to the central processor);

displaying a map showing the location of one or more of units (Paragraph 25 teaches displaying floor plan and the related database of tables and wait staff assignments);

allowing a staff member to input requests for patrons (Paragraph 19 – 23 teaches waiter or waitress to receive order from the patrons using the portable handheld device); and

receiving and processing requests from a plurality of staff (Paragraph 9 – 10, 19 – 23 teaches central server receiving and processing requests from wait staffs).

Therefore, from this teaching of Mayer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of Terase to include handheld staff computing device to show the location of tables and receive, display orders of the patrons as taught by Mayer to increase meal processing speed and reduce wasted time for the waiter's traverse (Paragraph 11).

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terase and Mayer, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

The combination of Terase and Mayer does not explicitly disclose storing information regarding past requests from each patron; and displaying information regarding past requests from particular patrons.

Cogen discloses System and method for placing orders at a restaurant directing the patron unit to store and display an item previously ordered by the patron (Paragraph 10).

Therefore, from this teaching of Cogen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service

management system which include patron unit/order terminal and handheld terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terase and Mayer to include enabling the customer to order same food as the customer previously ordered as taught by Cogen to enhance customer satisfaction.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terase, Mayer and Cogen, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claims 2 and 61, Terase teaches offering, via said patron units, at least one service selected from a group consisting of interactive video games, music, movies, Internet access, voice and telephony access (Column 11 lines 32 – 41 and Column 12 lines 18 – 22, Furthermore, Column 6 line 49 – Column 7 line 5 teaches the LCD display of the table top terminal is being used as game machine monitor. Therefore, The Examiner construes that the video game is played using the table top terminal and PHS terminal of employee is to enabling the game in order to charge the customer for playing time of the game).

As per Claims 3 and 67, Terase teaches wherein said processing request step comprising the step of routing requests to appropriate fulfillment centers (Column 11 line 32 – 41 and Column 12 lines 8 – 18).

As per Claims 6, 57, 66 and 93, Terasse teaches patrons can request bills via said patron units (Column 13 lines 26 – 55).

As per Claims 9 and 82, Terasse teaches displaying good and service offered by the venue on the patron units (Column 7 line 29 – 50).

As per Claims 11 and 62, Terasse teaches wherein said step of receiving and displaying information from said central computers includes displaying advertisements on the patron units (Column 12 lines 18 – 24).

As per Claims 12, 49 and 85, wherein advertisements are appurtenant to the request made by the patrons on the patron units (Column 11 lines 49 – 64 teaches different menu items with descriptions and graphics displayed on the order terminal. Table top terminal displays advertisement (in Column 12 line 18 – 24). The examiner construes that advertising appurtenants to the item ordered is equivalent to the menu item displayed on the order terminal that customer ordered. The Examiner further construes that, considering the reference as a whole, combining those two elements from the prior art, it is obvious to construe that Terasse teaches the advertisement which is pertinent to the menu items).

As per Claims 40 and 63, and 75, Terasé teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding directing the patron unit to display an item previously ordered by the patron to enable the patron to reorder the previously ordered item.

Cogen discloses System and method for placing orders at a restaurant directing the patron unit to display an item previously ordered by the patron to enable the patron to reorder the previously ordered item (Paragraph 10).

Therefore, from this teaching of Cogen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of Terasé to include enabling the customer to order same food as the customer previously ordered as taught by Cogen to enhance customer satisfaction.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasé and Cogen, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claims 41, 64 and 76, Terasé teaches all the element of the claimed invention but is silent regarding preference information regarding a patron.

Cogen discloses system and method for placing order at a restaurant having preference information regarding a patron (Paragraph 13).

Therefore, from this teaching of Cogen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of Terasa to include storing customer preference information as taught by Cogen to enhance customer satisfaction.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasa and Cogen, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claims 42 and 77, Terasa teaches directing the patron unit to display an estimate of the time to completion of a pending request (Column 12 lines 41 – Column 13 lines 25).

As per Claims 51 and 87, Terasa teaches directing a portable staff unit to indicate whether a request for a patron has been completed (Column 12 lines 40 – Column 13 lines 23).

As per Claim 54, 90, and 114, Terase teaches directing a portable staff unit to display patrons that are logged onto a network for the venue (Column 6 lines 53 – Column 7 lines 5).

As per Claim 55, 91, 115, Terase teaches directing a portable staff unit to display real-time activity of a patron which is performed concurrently on a portable patron device (Column 11 lines 31 – 40 and Column 13 lines 26 – 55 teaches real-time communication of patron activity to the PHS terminal).

As per Claim 58, Terase teaches direct a portable staff unit to display messages received from venue management (Abstract, Column 5 lines 8 – 13 and Column 14 lines 29 – 41 teaches communication between store control unit and the PHS terminals and graphic display send data to store control unit then to PHS terminals).

As per Claim 70, Terase teaches wherein said portable patron unit is a dedicated device capable of being handheld and carried by the patron, said portable patron unit being provided to the patron upon checking into the venue or after the patron enters a particular public area of the venue (Figure 3, Column 6 line 46 – Column 7 line 5 and Column 10 lines 57 – Column 11 lines 21).

As per Claims 73 and 123, Terase teaches wherein the display device is touch-screen display device (Column 6 lines 45 – Column 7 lines 5).

As per Claim 81, Terase teaches the user interface is configured to display messages to the patron (Column 11 lines 32 – 40).

As per Claims 118, 120, 122, 124, 125, 127, Terase teaches all the limitations of the claims (refer to Claims 1, 39, 50, 59, 69, 86, 94 and 110) except the use in a stadium/arena.

The Examiner notes, the use in a stadium/arena does not modify the operation of Terase's method and system, and to have modified the method and system of Terase to have included the use in a stadium/arena would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the inclusion of such step would have been an obvious matter of design choice in light of the method already disclosed by Terase. Such modification would not have otherwise affected the method and system of Terase and would have merely represented one of numerous steps or elements that the skilled artisan would have found obvious for the purposes already disclosed by Terase. Additionally, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated the criticality of providing this element/step versus the elements/steps disclosed by Terase. See *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

As per Claims 142, 146 – 149, Terase teaches communication link is wireless link (Column 11 line 16 – 26).

As per Claims 143 and 145, Terase teaches the location of the patron unit is transmitted to the central computer wirelessly (Abstract, Column 5 line 9 – 13 and Column 6 line 55 - Column 7 line 35 and Column 12 line 8 – 18 teaches that the terminal receptacle read the identification code from the table top terminal, and table top terminal incorporate the table identification code when it sends it's order wirelessly. Therefore, the central system would recognize the location of table top terminal using the identification code).

As per Claims 152 and 154, Terase teaches wherein said one or more central computer systems includes a point of sale capability or interfaces to an external point of sale capability (See at least Column 5 line 9 – 13).

6. Claims 10, 47, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terase in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Baratz (US 20040054585).

As per Claims 10, 47 and 83, the combination of Terase and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding displaying cross-sell and/or up-sell recommendations based on previous requests made by the patrons.

Baratz discloses sales enhancement system and method for retail businesses displaying cross-sell and/or up-sell recommendations based on previous requests made by the patrons (Paragraph 72 – 75).

Therefore, from this teaching of Baratz, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terasse and Cogen to include upsale feature as taught by Baratz to increase sales and profit.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasse and Cogen and Baratz, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

7. Claims 43, 78, 134, 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasse in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Toth. (US 20030078793).

As per Claims 43, 78, 134 and 139, the combination of Terasse and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding directing patron unit to authenticate the patron before the request is fulfilled.

Toth discloses enhanced customer-centric restaurant system directing patron unit to authenticate the patron before the request is fulfilled (Paragraph 71).

Therefore, from this teaching of Toth, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS

terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terasa and Cogen to include authenticate the patron before order is fulfilled as taught by Toth to deliver the ordered food to appropriate customer.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasa, Cogen and Toth, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

8. Claims 71 – 72, 129 – 131 and 140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasa in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Camaisa et al. (hereinafter Camaisa) (US 5845263).

As per Claims 71, 129 -131 and 140, the combination of Terasa and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding wherein the portable patron unit is configured to be secured to furniture used by the patron while in a particular public area of the venue.

Camaisa discloses interactive visual ordering system having wherein the portable patron unit is configured to be secured to furniture used by the patron while in a particular public area of the venue (Column 6 lines 27 – 30).

Therefore, from this teaching of Camaisa, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service

management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terase and Cogen to include ordering terminal is securely attached to furniture as taught by Camaisa to prevent the loss of the ordering terminal.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terase, Cogen and Camaisa, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claim 72, the combination of Terase and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding wherein the display device is large enough to enable a patron with myopia to read information displayed on the user interface without having to use corrective optical lenses.

Camaisa discloses interactive visual ordering system having wherein the display device is large enough to enable a patron with myopia to read information displayed on the user interface without having to use corrective optical lenses (Figure 6 – 15).

Therefore, from this teaching of Camaisa, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terase and Cogen to include ordering

terminal is large enough that user does not need optical lenses as taught by Camaisa to prevent the loss of the ordering terminal.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasé, Cogen and Camaisa, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

9. Claims 4 – 5, 7, 44, 52 – 53, 65, 68, 79, 92, 112 – 113 and 116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasé in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Ragsdale-Elliott et al. (Hereinafter Ragsdale) (US 20020147647).

As per Claims 4 and 68, the combination of Terasé and Cogen disclose notifying staffs via their portable staff units when specific requests are completed or ready for delivery from the appropriate fulfillment centers to the patrons (Column 12 lines 41 – Column 13 line 23), but is silent regarding staffs responsible for a particular order.

Ragsdale discloses wireless Maitre D' System for restaurants having staffs responsible for a particular order (Paragraph 89).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ragsdale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service

management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terase and Cogen to include display an order assign to a particular staff member as taught by Ragsdale to more effectively manage orders.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terase, Cogen and Ragsdale, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claims 5, 44, 79, 92 and 116, the combination of Terase and Cogen does disclose patron to page staff members for immediate assistance (Column 11 lines 32 – 41 and Column 16 lines 48 – 52), but is silent regarding staff members assigned to that patron.

Ragsdale discloses wireless Maitre D' System for restaurants having staff members assigned to that patron (Paragraph 89).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ragsdale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terase and Cogen to include display an order assign to a particular staff member as taught by Ragsdale to more effectively manage orders.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasse, Cogen and Ragsdale, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claims 7 and 65, the combination of Terasse and Cogen does disclose said portable staff units display a status of open requests on portable staff units (Column 8 line 40 – 52 and Column 12 line 40 – Column 13 lines 25 teaches that kitchen terminal send a response message to the PHS terminal when status of order is asked), but is silent regarding requests which are assigned to a particular staff member.

Ragsdale discloses wireless Maitre D' System for restaurants having requests which are assigned to a particular staff member (Paragraph 89).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ragsdale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terasse and Cogen to include display an order assign to a particular staff member as taught by Ragsdale to more effectively manage orders.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasse, Cogen and Ragsdale, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the

combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claims 52 and 112, the combination of Terasse and Cogen teaches the portable staff unit to display a request from the patron (Column 6 line 53 – Column 7 line 5 teaches LCD display panel on the PHS terminal and Column 8 line 40 – 64 teaches the employee can receive order from the patron and check the status of the order. Therefore, Terasse's invention teaches that PHS terminal, which is carried by the employee, displaying the order of the patron) but is silent regarding patron assigned to a particular staff member.

Ragsdale discloses wireless Maitre D' System for restaurants patron assigned to a particular staff member (Paragraph 89).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ragsdale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terasse and Cogen to include display an order assign to a particular staff member as taught by Ragsdale to more effectively manage orders.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasse, Cogen and Ragsdale, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention.

As per Claims 53 and 113, the combination of Terasé and Cogen teaches the portable staff unit to display a request from the patron (Column 6 line 53 – Column 7 line 5 of Terasé teaches LCD display panel on the PHS terminal and Column 8 line 40 – 64 of Terasé teaches the employee can receive order from the patron and check the status of the order. Therefore, the combination of Terasé's invention teaches that PHS terminal, which is carried by the employee, displaying the order of the patron) but is silent regarding orders assigned to a particular zone of responsibility.

Ragsdale discloses Wireless Maitre D' System for restaurant orders assigned to a particular zone of responsibility (Paragraph 89).

Therefore, from this teaching of Ragsdale, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terasé and Cogen to include display an order assign to a particular zone as taught by Ragsdale to more effectively manage orders.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasé, Cogen and Ragsdale, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

10. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terase in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Gold (US 20030089832).

As per Claim 74, the combination of Terase and Cogen teaches package configured to provide protection against other contaminants (Column 16 lines 57), but is silent regarding providing protection against sun.

Gold discloses multi-function accessory for handheld electronics providing protection against sun (Paragraph 19).

Therefore, from this teaching of Gold, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify providing protection to the terminal against water and other bacteria of the combination of Terase and Cogen to include protection against sunlight as taught by Gold to provide clearer image by eliminating the glares (Paragraph 19).

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terase, Cogen and Gold, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

11. Claims 132 – 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasse in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Leifer (US 20030088469).

As per Claim 132, The combination of Terasse and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding the patron unit storing data indicative of a location of the patron unit.

Leifer discloses restaurant management system having the patron unit storing data indicative of a location of the patron unit (Paragraph 35 – 36 teaches customer keypad having location identifier sending signals to the central station and central station identify the location of the customer based on the identifier signal sent from the customer keypad)

Therefore, from this teaching of Leifer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify restaurant ordering system of the combination of Terasse and Cogen to include patron unit storing data indicative of a location of the patron unit as taught by Leifer to deliver customer's order to correct customer.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasse, Cogen and Leifer, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claim 133, Terase, Cogen and Leifer do not explicitly disclose wherein the data indicative of the location comprises a room number. Terase, Cogen and Leifer do disclose data indication of the location including table numbers or specific customer location of the patron unit.

The Examiner notes, a room number does not modify the operation of Terase, Cogen and Leifer's method and system, and to have modified the method and system of Terase, Cogen and Leifer to have included a room number would have been obvious to the skilled artisan because the inclusion of such step would have been an obvious matter of design choice in light of the method and system already disclosed by Terase, Cogen and Leifer. Such modification would not have otherwise affected the method and system of Terase, Cogen and Leifer and would have merely represented one of numerous steps or elements that the skilled artisan would have found obvious for the purposes already disclosed by Terase, Cogen and Leifer. Additionally, applicant has not persuasively demonstrated the criticality of providing this step/element versus the steps/elements disclosed by Terase, Cogen and Leifer. See *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

12. Claims 135 – 136 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terase in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Walker et al. (Hereinafter Walker) (US 5794207).

As per Claims 135 and 139, the combination of Terasense and Cogent teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding wherein the authentication comprises enabling the patron unit to accept a biometric sample of the patron.

Walker discloses method and apparatus for a cryptographically assisted commercial network system designed to facilitate buyer-driven conditional purchase offers having wherein the authentication comprises enabling the patron unit to accept a biometric sample of the patron (Column 25 lines 35 – Column 26 lines 2).

Therefore, from this teaching of Walker, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Terasense and Cogent to include authenticate the customer using biometric samples as taught by Walker to ensure the food is delivered to correct patron.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasense, Cogent and Walker, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

As per Claim 136, the combination of Teraser and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding wherein said biometric sample is a fingerprint.

Walker discloses method and apparatus for a cryptographically assisted commercial network system designed to facilitate buyer-driven conditional purchase offers having wherein said biometric sample is a fingerprint (Column 25 lines 35 – Column 26 lines 2).

Therefore, from this teaching of Walker, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify service management system which include patron unit/order terminal and PHS terminal/portable staff unit of the combination of Teraser and Cogen to include authenticate the customer using biometric samples such as fingerprint as taught by Walker to ensure the food is delivered to correct patron.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Teraser, Cogen and Walker, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

13. Claim 144 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraser in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen and in further view of Fano (US 6317718).

As per Claim 144, the combination of Terasé and Cogen teaches all the elements of the claimed invention but is silent regarding GPS receiver and location information via using GPS receiver.

Fano discloses system, method and article of manufacture for location based filtering for shopping agent in the physical world having GPS receiver and location information via using GPS receiver (Abstract).

Therefore, from this teaching of Fano, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify handheld unit used by patron transmit the location of the unit of Terasé and Cogen to include GPS receiver and obtaining location information using GPS receiver as taught by Fano to obtain precise location information.

Furthermore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior arts of Terasé, Cogen and Fano, and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 7 December 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 39, 50, 59, 69, 86, 110 under Terasé in view of Cogen have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Terasse in view of Mayer and in further view of Cogen.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Coleman (US 5602730) discloses restaurant management system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ig T. An whose telephone number is (571)270-5110. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9:30 AM to 5 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on 571-272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew S Gart/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3687

/lg T. An/
Examiner, Art Unit 3687